

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PARAMJIT SINGH BASRA,

Petitioner,

v.

RON HAYNES,

Respondent.

CASE NO. C22-0217-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the objections of Petitioner (Dkt. No. 10) to United States Magistrate Judge Theresa L. Fricke's report and recommendation ("R&R") (Dkt. No. 7). Having thoroughly considered the relevant record, the Court finds oral argument unnecessary and ADOPTS Judge Fricke's report and recommendation.

A district court must conduct a *de novo* review of those portions of a magistrate judge's R&R to which a party properly objects. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). A party properly objects when he or she files "specific written objections" to the magistrate judge's R&R as required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2). In contrast, general objections or summaries of arguments previously presented have the same effect as no objection at all since they do not focus the Court's attention on any specific issues for review. *Howard v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). This Court's consideration of such "objections" would entail *de novo* review of the entire report, rendering the referral to the

1 magistrate judge useless and causing a duplication of time and effort that wastes judicial
2 resources and contradicts the purposes of the Magistrates Act. *Id.* Accordingly, *de novo* review is
3 not required when a party fails to direct the court to a specific error in R&R. *Strawbridge v.*
4 *Sugar Mountain Resort, Inc.*, 243 F.Supp.2d 472, 475 (W.D.N.C. 2003).

5 Judge Fricke recommends the Court dismiss the petition without prejudice because it is a
6 successive petition which Petitioner filed without authorization from the Court of Appeals. (Dkt.
7 No. 7 at 2.) *See also* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A); Ninth Circuit Rule 22-3(a).

8 Petitioner filed objections to the R&R agreeing with Judge Fricke's assessment but
9 nonetheless requesting his petition not be dismissed due to the leniency afforded *pro se* litigants.
10 (Dkt. No. 10 at 1.) This does not merit *de novo* review as it does not direct the Court to any
11 specific error in the report. *Strawbridge*, 243 F.Supp.2d at 475. And while *pro se* litigants are
12 held to a more lenient standard, *see Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007), that does not
13 excuse them from abiding by the rules of the court in which they litigate. *Carter v.*
14 *Commissioner*, 784 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1986). Nor does it permit this Court to entertain
15 his petition without proper jurisdiction. *See* Ninth Circuit Rule 22-3(a).

16 Accordingly, the Court ORDERS as follows:

- 17 (1) The Court ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation;
18 (2) This matter is DISMISSED without prejudice; and
19 (4) The Clerk is DIRECTED to send a copy of this order to Petitioner.

20
21 DATED this 15th day of July 2022.

22
23
24
25
26


John C. Coughenour
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE